

Remarks:

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated May 21, 2003, and has amended the claims to distinctively claim the subject matter of the invention. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 14 have been amended and claims 2, 5, 8, 15 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments is found within the specification and the drawings. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,434 (the West reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,205 (the Furuhashi reference). For the reasons provided below, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references are non-analogous prior art and therefore improper 102 or 103 references.

The West reference is directed to an image scaling circuit for increasing or decreasing the size of a sampled image to match a fixed resolution display. Particularly, this reference teaches resizing frames of image data at high speed in flat panel displays by a real number scale factor (Abstract, col. 2, lns. 12-15 and 24-30). Thus, the West reference is directed to a field of endeavor related to resizing image data in flat panel displays. The problem solved by the West reference is to allow scaling based on real number scale factors, as opposed to integer scale factors.

The Furuhashi reference is directed to a control device for a liquid crystal display which can display pictures in a magnification mode by using a memory having low-speed access and a low storage capacity (Abstract). The problem solved by the Furuhashi reference is to minimize the cost of production of liquid crystal displays by introducing a method to use a low cost memory instead of the more expensive high-speed access high capacity memory (col. 1, lns. 15-17 and col. 2, lns. 54-67).

The criteria for determining whether prior art is analogous are two-fold. First, one must determine whether the art is from the same field of endeavor, regardless of the problem addressed. Second, if the reference is not within the field of the inventor's endeavor, one must determine whether the reference still is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is involved. In re Deminski, 796 F.2d 436, 442, 230 USPQ 313, 315 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Wood, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036, 202 USPQ 171, 174 (CCPA 1979).

In contrast to the West and Furuhashi references, the field of endeavor of the claimed invention is directed to correcting Keystone distortion, which results in a trapezoidal display of a nominally rectangular picture. This distortion is produced, generally, when a picture is projected abnormally to the screen. According to the present invention, digital correcting means instead of physical means, such as optical lenses, are utilized to correct this particular type of distortion.

Thus, both the field of endeavor and the problems solved by the present invention are different from those disclosed in the prior art references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the pending claims to be withdrawn, because the cited references are non-analogous art.

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 have been amended to recite "a sync signal generator that generates read control signals based on sync signals and horizontal output sizes; and a line memory that stores each line of said output image generated from said format converter and outputs said stored line of said output image according to said read control signals." (See Fig. 3B). Neither of the referenced portions, nor any other portions of the cited references disclose, teach, or suggest either a signal generator or line memory with the characteristics disclosed above for "generating read control signals based on sync signals and horizontal output sizes; and storing each line of output image generated from a format converter and outputting stored line of the output image according to the read control signals."

A claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 when a single prior art reference expressly or inherently discloses each and every element of the claim in question. Tyler Refrigeration v. Kysor Indus. Corp., 777 F.2d 687, 227 USPQ 845 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Since the cited references fail to disclose at least one of the recited elements in the amended claims, a rejection under §102 would be improper.

Further, it is well settled that for a rejection to be proper under section 35 U.S.C. §103(a), there must be some motivation or suggestion to combine, in the prior art references themselves, to come up with the claimed invention. That is, prior art references in combination do not make an invention obvious unless something in the prior art references would suggest the advantage to be derived from combining the teachings." In re Sernaker, 217 USPQ 1, 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art references cannot be combined to teach the claimed invention. There is no indication in the Office Action, how such combination is possible, as the two systems are independently complex and cannot be easily modified to work

with each other. Further, even if the two systems can be combined, the resultant combination will not function to address the problem solved by the present invention. Therefore, the two references cannot be combined to teach the claimed invention.

Even further, “[i]n rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. ‘A prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.’ In re Rijken, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The West reference, neither alone nor in combination with the Furuhashi reference, teaches or describes the claimed invention, as amended.

That is, neither of the referenced portions, nor any other portions of the cited references disclose, teach, or suggest either a signal generator or line memory with the characteristics disclosed above for “generating read control signals based on sync signals and horizontal output sizes; and storing each line of output image generated from a format converter and outputting stored line of the output image according to the read control signals.” The Examiner is invited to point out the relevant portions of the cited references with more specificity.

For the above reasons, the invention as recited in the amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 is distinguishable over the references cited by the Examiner. Claims 3, 6, 9-13 and 16-20, respectively depending on claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 should also be in condition for allowance, by the virtue of being dependent upon allowable independent claims.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

//

//

Respectfully submitted,
LEE & HONG

Date: September 16, 2003

By: 

F. Jason Far-hadian, Esq.
Registration No. 42,523

LEE & HONG
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telephone: (213) 623-2221
Facsimile: (213) 623-2211

PLEASE NOTE THE NEW CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER.